

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/619,676	Applicant(s) RENZ, CHARLES J.	
	Examiner Charles E. Cooley	Art Unit 1723	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Charles E. Cooley (PTO). (3) _____.

(2) Erica Dorsey (App. Rep.). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner phoned to inquire regarding the status of the application since no response was apparently filed after the final rejection of 3 DEC 2004. App. Rep. claims a review of the their file indicates the final rejection was not received by the attorney of record. However, since the 6-month period for response has expired, the application is constructively abandoned. App. Rep. therefore intends to file a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment based upon failure to receive an office action (see MPEP 711.03(c)(II)) .